

**Draft Summary of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)  
January 29, 2004**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group (RSWG) on January 29, 2004 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 4	Resource Action Matrix "Key"
Attachment 5	Presentation: SP-R2 (Recreation Safety Assessment)
Attachment 6	Presentation: SP-R11 (Recreation and Public Use Impact Assessment)
Attachment 7	Presentation: SP-R16 (Whitewater and River Boating Report)
Attachment 8	Presentation: Recreation and Tourism Economy in Oroville
Attachment 9	Presentation: Property Values Analysis
Attachment 10	Resource Action "A-List," Color Coded for Cross Resource Issues

## **Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the RSWG meeting. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations and the desired outcomes of the meeting were discussed. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

## **Action Items – December 18, 2003 RSWG Meeting**

A summary of the December 18, 2003 RSWG meeting is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

<b>Action Item #R98:</b>	Distribute schedule for release of study reports.
Status:	A hard-copy study report schedule was not available for distribution to the RSWG however Doug Rischbieter (DWR) outlined the anticipated schedule for the 16 remaining study reports. Tonight's meeting includes reports on R2, R11, R16, and Phase 2 of the Background Report for R18 and R19. In February, it is anticipated that R9, R15, R14, and possibly R4 reports will be distributed and presented to the RSWG. Reports R13 and R7 will be released in March. The release of studies R18 and R19 is dependent on review by the Socioeconomics Technical Review Team (TRT). The goal is to have all studies with the exception of R17 (Recreation Needs Analysis) completed and reports distributed, by April 2004. R17 uses information generated by all of the other recreation studies and is expected to be completed by June 2004. Doug clarified with the JPA how many copies of the reports they require. The studies presented at tonight's meeting should be posted on the project web site by the end of next week. One participant asked whether the license application would include all of the technical study reports; DWR confirmed that the license application would include all of the reports.

## **De-Brief on Presentation to Plenary Group**

Doug Rischbieter made a presentation to the Plenary Group on January 27, 2004 identifying proposed resource actions related to recreation and socioeconomics that the RSWG recommends for further analysis. The purpose of the presentation was to seek approval from the Plenary Group to move the proposed "A-list" recommended for further analysis to the PDEA Team. Doug noted that all of the lists developed by the RSWG had been provided to the Plenary Group and the PDEA Team. In total, 233 resource actions are on the RSWG's Resource Action Matrix, organized as follows: 76 proposals on the "A" list (43 have resource action identification forms completed), 86 proposals on the "B" list (18 have forms completed), 73 proposals on the "Settlement" list (30 have forms completed), and 18 on the "Trails" list (3 have forms completed). The Plenary Group presentation included an overview of the process used to develop the resource action list. Doug distributed the key for justification of sub-list assignment from the Resource Action Matrix that was not included in the Plenary Group presentation (Attachment 4).

Doug reported that representatives from the JPA and Butte County identified several resource actions that are supported by the public but not included on the 'A' list. The Plenary Group discussed the situation and suggested that the RSWG re-consider the placement of the six identified resource actions. They acknowledged that any re-consideration would not result in analysis to be incorporated in the April 2004 PDEA. Michael Pierce (Butte County) suggested that if the resource actions in question will be included in cross-resource discussions, Butte County would withdraw their request that the "A-List" be amended.

## **Study Reports**

The Consultant Team made presentations to the RSWG on three study reports (R2- *Recreation Safety Assessment*, R11- *Recreation and Public Use Impact Assessment*, and R16- *Whitewater and River Boating Report*), as well as two components of the Phase 2 Background Report for Socioeconomic Studies: the *Recreation and Tourism Economy in Oroville* and the *Property Values Analysis*. The PowerPoint presentations outlining each of these reports are included as part of the meeting notes as Attachments 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 respectively.

The RSWG discussed how flows at the Afterbay outlet might affect angler safety and public use impacts to the Oroville Wildlife Area (OWA) involving vehicle access issues. The RSWG also discussed potential conflicts between river boaters and lake boaters. DWR confirmed that Big Bend Dam is within the FERC Project 2100 boundary, though it is owned by PG&E (not DWR). The participants discussed the various whitewater park proposed locations and Eric Zigas (City of Oroville) indicated that the preferred location from the City's perspective is described in LF-28.

Tom Wegge (TCW Economics) discussed the Phase 2 Background Report on the Recreation and Tourism Economy in Oroville and noted that the report had been reviewed by the TRT. He also reviewed the Property Values Analysis and noted some counterintuitive results. Kevin Ziegler suggested that the unexpected results could be representing a lag from a statewide recession in the early 1990s.

The RSWG was asked to review the reports and provide comments in writing or at the next RSWG meeting. All study report presenters will be in attendance at the next RSWG meeting to answer questions. It was noted that all of the information presented in these studies is preliminary.

## **Cross-Resource Resource Actions**

The RSWG discussed the need for increased coordination regarding cross-resource impacts associated with the proposed resource actions that are under consideration in each of the work groups. The Facilitator described a joint Task Force between the Environmental Work Group

(EWG) and the Engineering and Operations Work Group (EOWG) that has been initiated to address environmental and operational cross-resource impact issues related to flow and temperature. In the context of this relicensing process, a cross-resource impact is where there exist clear conflicts for approval of a resource action, such as increased power boating within the OWA even though the activity is not allowed under current CDFG regulations. DWR distributed a revised Resource Action Matrix ("A-List" only) using color-coding to facilitate the organization of cross-resource impacts by primary cross resource area (Attachment 9).

The color code is as follows:

- Stipple/Shaded = resource action information form completed
- Blue = dependency on flow or temperature
- Pink = potential impact to wildlife
- Yellow = potential conflicts with cultural resources
- Orange = new development location
- White = expansion at existing location

The RSWG discussed the initial categorization of resource action on the "A" list and noted the majority of the issues are related to environmental resources. Agreeing on the need for further coordination on this issue, the RSWG initiated a joint Task Force between the RSWG and EWG. DWR will discuss the joint Task Force logistics and agenda with Terry Mills, RAM for the EWG. Meetings with other work groups such as the Cultural Resources Work Group will be scheduled in the future. One participant suggested this process not be restricted to only resource actions on the "A" list, but rather should include all proposals for which a Resource Action Information Form (RAIF) has been submitted. The Butte County representative suggested that if the cross-resource discussion would expand to this scope, Butte County might withdraw its insistence that several Resource Actions not currently on the "A-List" be moved there. The RSWG discussed this suggestion and DWR agreed to review and color code all resource actions with a submitted RAIF on the "B" and "Settlement" lists for evaluation during cross-resource area discussions.

The RSWG discussed the Trails list and why those resource actions are not included in the cross-resource matrix. Doug Rischbieter explained that the "Trails" lists was developed for organizational purposes and to facilitate evaluation in the PDEA; each individual trails component will remain as a separate resource action for tracking purposes, but will not be evaluated separately in the PDEA. These components will serve as the building blocks for a future trails plan for the entire Project area. It was noted that current issues surrounding trails in the existing license need to be resolved. Doug explained that the trails planning effort would be coordinated with the development of the DPR General Plan for the LOSRA. It is envisioned that a formal trails plan or General Plan trails element will be included as part of the FERC Recreation Plan and the DPR General Plan, and these two plans should be consistent in terms of the treatment of trails. The trails package developed by the Dangermond Group and JPA trails task force is included on the "A" list. The RSWG acknowledged that there are differing views regarding whether existing baseline conditions pertaining to trails represent activities that are in or out of compliance with the existing license.

## **Next Steps**

The relationship between the Recreation Needs Assessment and the proposed resource actions was discussed. Subsequent drafts of the PDEA will have more defined resource actions that will be developed after the Needs Assessment is complete. The resource actions will remain on the four lists developed and presented to the Plenary Group for organizational purposes.

The RSWG discussed resource actions that have been transferred to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group from other work groups. Three resource actions have been transferred from the Land Use Work Group, including proposals related to increased

communication, renovation of Bedrock Park, and shifting a portion of Matthews Ready Mix property to public trust control.

The relationship between the relicensing process and the DPR General Plan process was discussed. Doug noted that these two planning processes will have a strong relationship and consistency and the schedules for the two projects are very similar. The General Plan process will rely heavily on information generated from the FERC relicensing process. DWR will submit a proposed Recreation Plan with their license application in 2005, with a draft available for review by the Collaborative in approximately six months. The CEQA process for the DPR General Plan is expected to start in the summer of 2004, which is prior to submittal of the license application.

The RSWG discussed whether the DWR Recreation Plan would look at non-jurisdictional lands (outside the FERC project boundary). Dale Hoffman-Floerke suggested that while DWR is not contemplating off-site activities, part of a plan could include facilities and proposals outside the FERC boundary. Moreover, it was noted that the FERC boundary could be subject to change through the settlement process.

The Facilitator reported that the Kelly Ridge Meeting Room is not available for the scheduled February RSWG meeting date but noted that the February 24<sup>th</sup> Plenary Group meeting has been cancelled and that date is available to the Collaborative. The RSWG discussed the desire to initiate the RSWG/EWG Cross Resource Task Force and agreed to hold that meeting during the day and the RSWG meeting during the evening of February 24, 2004. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed on the following meeting date/time:

Date: Tuesday, February 24, 2004  
Time: 6:00 to 10:00 PM  
Location: Kelly Ridge Golf Course Meeting Room, Oroville

#### ***Cross-Resource Impact Task Force Meeting with Environmental Work Group***

Date: Tuesday, February 24, 2004  
Time: 1:00 to 4:30 PM  
Location: Kelly Ridge Golf Course Meeting Room, Oroville

#### **Action Items**

The following list of action items identified by the RSWG includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

**Action Item #R99:** Send technical study reports to JPA members as they are completed.  
**Responsible:** DWR  
**Due Date:** *Ongoing*

**Action Item #R100:** Color code all resource actions on the "B" and "Settlement" lists with a submitted RAIF for cross-resource impacts.  
**Responsible:** DWR  
**Due Date:** February 24, 2004